

human immunodeficiency virus, and for other purposes.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:15 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:15 p.m.

□ 1720

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA) at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON H.R. 4380, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Report No. 105-670), on the bill (H.R. 4380), making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 469.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL DEBATE ON SHAYS AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2183, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2183, in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 442 and the order of the House of July 17, 1998, that the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) be debatable for not to exceed 40 minutes to be equally divided and the time controlled by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON STEPS TAKEN TO END ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105-295)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the request contained in section 540 of Public Law 105-118, Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998, I submit to you the attached report providing information on steps taken by the United States Government to bring about an end to the Arab league boycott of Israel and to expand the process of normalizing ties between Israel and the Arab league countries.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 30, 1998.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 442 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2183.

□ 1724

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2183) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes, with Mrs. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, July 31, 1998, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) to amendment No. 13 offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 17, 1998, no other amendment to amendment No. 13 is in order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) each control an additional 20 minutes of debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) so that he would be allowed to control 10 minutes of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to the Members of this Chamber and to all my colleagues that this is truly an historic opportunity to restore integrity to the political process and vote for the Meehan-Shays substitute, which will ban soft money, the unlimited sums, from individuals, corporations, labor unions, and other interest groups, recognize sham issue ads for truly what they are, campaign ads, improve FEC disclosure and enforcement and establish a commission to further study reforms to our campaign system.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to say that the House, in an orderly fashion, has discussed a number of issues surrounding campaign reform and that we reach a point tonight in which a major decision will be made by the House, and we reach this point almost entirely with an open rule and mutually agreed upon unanimous consent, which indicates that even on an issue as difficult as this, if reasonable people of goodwill will sit down and resolve the issues that separate them, the House can in fact move forward.

This particular substitute, the Shays-Meehan bill, has gone through a number of permutations over the years. At one time, Political Action Committees were seen to be the primary enemy of the Republic, and the current version views the fundamental erosion of the American experiences tied to what is often called soft money.

Sometimes the terms that are used in political debate, although we have all grown accustomed to them, are sometimes confusing to people who do not make this their life's work.

The idea of hard money is simply money raised under the Federal Election Act associated directly with elections, would be hard money. Other money would be so-called soft money. What this bill attempts to do is to quote, unquote ban soft money from Federal elections.

One of the difficulties in attempting to do something like this is that we had better have a definition and a ban that works for all evenly and equally, and I think one of the fundamental flaws in the Shays-Meehan bill is that it simply does not do that. Although it purports to ban soft money, it bans soft money only in regard, for example, to political parties.

Political parties are unique institutions in the American political experience. They are the only institutions